

REMARKS

Editorial corrections have been made to the specification. Figures 9 and 12A have been amended (as discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings"). Claims 1 - 2, 9, and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these corrections or amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 16 remain in the application.

I. Double Patenting Rejection

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated August 26, 2004 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 12, 17 of copending Application No. 09/930,359, in view of U.S. Patent 6,266,811 to Nabahi. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith, and the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed 8/2001 and 9/2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance in regard to some content included, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information. The IDS forms which are stamped as being received on "02 Sep 12" and "Dec 09 2002" have been inadvertently filed in the wrong file, and do not pertain to the

present application. (While these IDS forms specify the serial number of the present application, it should be noted that the Applicant name does not match the present invention. It is likely that the serial number on these IDS forms has digits that are transposed.) These mis-filed IDS forms should not be considered further by the Examiner of the present invention. Applicants believe that the IDS bearing the date "08/15/01", which does belong in the file of the present application, is in compliance with the statute.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 5,966,540 to Lister et al. in view of U. S. Patent 5,495,610 to Shing et al., U. S. Publication 2002/0104071 to Charisius et al., and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,266,811 to Nabahi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 9, and 13 to more clearly specify that an object model according to their invention comprises a suite level and a component level. Applicants do not find teachings of this structure in any of the references.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the analysis on p. 5 of the Office Action (see, for example, lines 1, 3, and 13) refers to "neutral objects". Applicants' claim language does not specify "neutral objects", and thus the relevance of the term to Applicants' claimed invention is not clear.

Applicants respectfully submit that their dependent Claims 2 - 8, 10 - 12, and 14 - 16 are patentable over the references by virtue of the allowability of the independent claims. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)

Serial No. 09/930,325

-15-

RSW920010066US1